

\*NOTE - Please be sure to read the announcements as the time limitation prevented them being presented at the meeting.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES - April 13 and 27, 1976

Chair, Lezlie Labhard  
Vice Chair, David Saveker  
Secretary, Charles Jennings

- I. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 3:15 PM in University Union 220.
- II. All members were present except: Amanzio, Brown, Loh, Hariri and Miller.  
Substitutes: Sullivan for Wenzl, Webster for Bermann, Genthner for Niu, and Blodgett for Scales.  
Guest: David Schaffner.  
Excused absences: Dave Saveker, Keith Nielsen.
- III. The minutes for March 9/April 6, 1976, were approved.
- IV. Reports
  - A. Statewide Senate (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy) - No report.
  - B. Administrative Council (Weatherby) - No report.
  - C. Academic Council (Jones) The Academic Council took the following actions:
    1. Minor revisions on policy governing the naming of buildings.
    2. One part of student withdrawal policy.
    3. Endorsed the department head job description.
  - D. Consultative Committee - Dean, Science and Math (Eatough) The committee has screened 163 applicants. There are twenty or less applicants still being reviewed. Less than ten candidates will be interviewed on campus.
  - E. Consultative Committee - Dean, Ag. and Natural Resources (Rogalla) No report.
  - F. Consultative Committee - Director, Library (Sparling)(Att. IV-F).
  - G. Executive Committee (Jennings) - The minutes for March 30 were noted. Special note was given to the action taken on the Task Force on Student Writing Skills.
  - H. Foundation Board (Labhard)(Attachment IV-H).
  - I. President's Council (Labhard)(Attachment IV-I).

4/13-27 Minutes  
V. Committee Reports

- A. Budget (Nielsen) - No report.
- B. Curriculum (Cirovic) - No report.
- C. Election (Rathbun) - There is a need for more nominations.
- D. Instruction (Greffenius, Jennings) - The committee is going to mail a packet of opinionnaires on final examination policy to each Senator to distribute to their respective departmental faculty. All faculty are to be encouraged to participate.
- E. Personnel Policies (Beecher) - No report.
- F. Student Affairs (Culver) - No report.
- G. General Education and Breadth Requirements (Riedlsperger) - No report.
- H. Constitution and ByLaws (Gold) - No report.
- I. Long-Range Planning (Dundon) - The committee is now receiving goal statements from schools/departments. The committee needs faculty members who are interested in planning, statistics, and other technical areas relating to the long-range planning of institutions.
- J. Personnel Review (Kann) - No report.
- K. Research (Thomas) - No report.
- L. Fairness Board (Eatough) - No report.
- M. Faculty Library (Krupp) - The committee is still reviewing periodicals and the utilization of the armory space.
- N. Distinguished Teaching Awards (Roberts) - No report.

VI. Business Items

- A. CAM 342.2 Academic Promotions (Beecher) - It was M/S (Beecher) that the document (agenda attachment IV-A) be adopted and forwarded to the President.

It was M/S (Buffa) to amend the document in concept by changing it to read two lists to be forwarded rather than one list.

It was M/S/P (Moore) to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 4:45 PM.

The next meeting will be April 27, 1976, at 3:15 PM in UU 220.

---

ACADEMIC SENATE

April 27, 1976

(April 13 - cont'd.)

- I. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, in UU 220 at 3:15 PM.

All members were present except: Tim Gaskin.

Excused absences: Mary Stallard, David Saveker.

Substitutes: Damann for Rathbun, Phillips for Ruggles, and Horton for Boone.

## II. Business Items

- A. CAM 342.2 Academic Promotions (Beecher) - It was M/S/F (Beecher) that the Academic Senate adopt the resolution as presented by the Personnel Policies Committee.

By discussion and further clarification, the amendment was changed to read three lists from two lists.

It was M/S/F (Buffa) that the document be amended in concept by changing it to read three lists to be forwarded rather than one list.

It was M/S/P (Beecher) that the Senate appoint an Ad Hoc Committee for the Implementation ~~of~~ ACR 70 and report to the Senate at the December meeting of the Senate.

- B. Naming Buildings (Murphy) - It was M/S/P (Murphy) that the resolution be adopted by the Academic Senate and forwarded to the President.

- C. Faculty Input in the Budgetary Process (Nielsen) - It was M/S/P (Nielsen) that the Senate adopt the resolution as presented by the Budget Committee.

It was M/S/F (Kersten) to amend by adding the word budget between the words instructional and allocations in line 4 of item 3) of the resolve and strike the last sentence of item 3) of the resolve.

- D. Curriculum Packages (Cirovic) - It was M/S/P (Cirovic) to approve the Curriculum package from the school of Architecture and Environmental Design.

It was M/S/F (Beecher) that the proposal be amended by excluding the Eng. 218 selection until there is consultation between the English Department and the school of Architecture and Environmental Design.

## III. Announcements (Labhard)

- A. Academic Senate Resolution on Consultative Procedure - Curriculum Package - This has been referred to the Academic Council by President Kennedy. (Att. III-A)
- B. Academic Senate Resolution regarding CAM 341.1 - Consultative Procedures on Personnel Matters - This has been referred to Don Shelton for review by Vice President Hazel Jones and other personnel as appropriate. (Att. III-A)
- C. Academic Senate Resolution regarding C/NC Grading for Post Baccalaureate and Graduate Students - This has been referred to the Academic Council by President Kennedy. (Att. III-A)
- D. Dennis Friend Memorial Fund - Contributions may be sent to the ASI Business Office in the University Union.
- E. Title IX - Information on Title IX is on file in the Senate Office.

- F. Turnaround Time for the Academic Senate Office - Allow at least one week for typing, duplication, etc.
- G. Policy and Procedure Revisions in CAM-(Att. III-A).
- H. Parking Spaces - The Senate Office has received three 2-hour reserved parking spaces in the parking lot adjacent to Chase Hall. These are for the benefit of the Senate Officers, Senators, Committee Members and other faculty when they have business in the Senate Office. Persons parking in these spaces for other reasons will be ticketed.
- I. Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language - Gerald Marley, Chair CSUC Academic Senate has requested that the attached guidelines be made available for all faculty. (Att. III-I)
- J. Report From the Vice Chair - Correspondence received from David Saveker indicates that he will not be returning to his regular teaching position this quarter. He has expressed appreciation for all the cards and well-wishes.
- K. Commencement Reminder: Alan Miller, Grand Marshal for commencement requested that Senators urge faculty participation in commencement:
- " Any Cal Poly faculty or staff member who holds a baccalaureate degree or higher is invited to participate in the commencement procession and ceremony on Saturday, June 12, from 2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Please notify your department head or supervisor so that appropriate information may be furnished. Department heads and supervisors are asked to report a count of participants by memo or phone to the Liberal Studies Office, Lib. 214, Ext. 2935, by May 14. Rental or purchase orders for academic regalia must be placed with Mary L. Green in the bookstore by May 14."
- L. Disabled Student Awareness Day: The Disabled Student Awareness Day Program was held on April 27th at 11:00 AM in Chumash Auditorium. Less than ten faculty attended. The lack of support for this program, especially after the Senators voted to increase awareness of the concerns of disabled students, was most regrettable.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 4:48 PM.

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be May 11, 1976 at 3:15 PM in UU 220.

Respectfully submitted,

*Charles Jennings*  
Charles Jennings  
Secretary

# Memorandum

: Lezlie Labhard, Chair  
Academic Senate

Date : April 12, 1976

ACADEMIC SENATE File No.:

APR 15 1976

Copies : -

CAL POLY - SLO

From : Shirley Sparling  
Chairman of the Consultative Committee for the Selection of the Library Head  
Subject:

The Consultative Committee for the selection of a new library head has met three times and is in the process of screening the applicants for the position. There are about 50 candidates at present. The deadline for applications is April 15th and the committee hopes to be able to make its recommendations to the administration in June.

I have a class at the time of the Academic Senate meeting tomorrow and will be unable to attend.

*Shirley Sparling*



FOUNDATION BOARD - April 13

1. APPROVED - 1976 Food Service Summer Program

Vista Grande Restaurant will be open during the week for conferences, staff, etc. (but not meal ticket customers) and closed on Saturday and Sunday.

2. APPROVED - some of the recommendations regarding distribution of general and administrative costs of the foundation; costs will be prorated to the various activities based on services rendered. The entire report is in the Senate Office and discussion will continue at the next meeting.

3. ACCEPTED - Gift Report.

4. REPORT - Annual Giving Program

Recruitment for coordinator - 78 applications have been received.

5. REPORT - Status HEP

The program has been funded for next year; will probably not be "housed" in Palm Royal.

Att. IV-H, 4/27/76  
Ac.Senate Minutes

PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL - April 12

1. Rose Float Presentation - a slide show with music presented showing the building of "High Hopes".
2. Poly Royal Final Preparations - The progress on Poly Royal was discussed; the list of Board Approved Activities was distributed.
3. Legislative Report - The report was presented by Howard West and will be attached to the minutes.
4. Capital Outlay Program Update - Architecture Building is 65% complete; offices will be ready in Fall; classrooms will be ready during the Fall quarter. Funds for Crandall will probably be reestablished. The Trustees have accepted the schematics on the Faculty Office Building.

Att. IV-I, 4/27/76  
Ac.Senate Minutes

## Memorandum

To : President's Council

Date : April 9, 1976

File No.:

Copies :

From : Howard West *West*

Subject: Legislative Report

There are well over 100 bills which have been introduced and are under consideration by the Legislature having an impact upon postsecondary education. A number have already been acted upon, including several proposed by the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, some of which were at the direct request of Cal Poly. Among the legislation already acted upon is the legislation proposed by Assemblyman Vasconcellos which would have required that all accrediting associations hold public meetings in California at the time they are considering accreditation of a California institution. Although passed by the Assembly, this bill has been held over in the Senate Education Committee, with a strong indication that the bill would have to be significantly amended or contain a provision that it be referred to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in order to get any kind of favorable reaction.

On the other hand, a bill introduced at the request of the Trustees, which would have provided an opportunity for CSUC campuses to be relieved of the requirement that all printing be done through the Office of State Printing, has been defeated in committee. Others in which Cal Poly is directly interested include a bill relating to PERS legislation affecting auxiliary organizations, making it possible for auxiliaries to provide the same level of reduction in employee contributions as that provided to state employees. The bill has passed the Assembly and is in the Senate. Another bill would provide the local campus fire fighters with the same PERS retirement benefits as other fire fighters with other state agencies and will be heard later this month.

There are two major issues relating to higher education about which a series of bills have been introduced but which have not as yet had any hearings, and, therefore, the future of them is unknown. However, if any or all of these bills are passed, then they will have a significant effect upon the CSUC and Cal Poly. The first

*RH. 10-1a*



issue relates to impacted campuses and professional students about which I have previously reported to the President's Council. Assemblyman Wilson has introduced two bills on this subject, one of which would require that when a campus has received more applicants than it can accommodate, it shall be designated as impacted. This bill would establish criteria for selective admissions that would include scholarship in determining priority of admission of the applicants. The bill which he introduced relating to professional students is significantly different than the one which we saw in draft form prior to its introduction. As introduced, this bill would now establish a unit credit bank for each student that would consist of the number of units required by his degree objective, plus 12. As a student takes courses, he would "draw down" on this credit bank, and once exhausted the student would then be required to pay the full cost of instruction for any additional units which he took. The bill applies only to undergraduate programs and provides for an adjustment in the unit credit bank for one change of major.

The other major issue relates to a series of bills on informal and innovative education introduced by Assemblyman Vasconcellos. These bills include the following:

1. AB 3375--This bill would establish an instructional improvement fund to be administered by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. To provide funding for this fund a complicated formula has been established, but in summary, beginning in 1977-78 and continuing through 1980-81, an increased percentage proportion of appropriation for the CSUC and the University of California would be taken from these two segments to be used for this fund.
2. AB 4322--This bill would establish the Golden State College as a fourth segment of public higher education, described as an open college allowing individuals to work with faculty advisors to create unique personalized educational programs. The legislation specifies the learning activities that could be included, indicates that the college would maintain a credit bank, and grant degrees.
3. AB 4323--This bill would establish a statewide network of Educational Services Centers to provide a series of services to individuals to be known as "educational brokering" which would include provision of information about referral to appropriate postsecondary institutions, student assessment, career and educational advising, and assistance in coping with institutional red tape.

ADH. 10-J 6

4. AB 4324--In order to fund the Golden State College and the Educational Services Centers referenced above, this bill would reallocate funds from the instructional budget of the CSUC, the instructional and departmental research budget of the University of California, the University of California Cooperative Extension and the ungraded courses of community colleges.
5. AB 4325--This bill would establish a state policy of fiscal support for external degree programs, and would request the California Postsecondary Education Commission to direct an intersegmental task force to ensure equitable state policies for part-time students.
6. AB 4326--This bill would establish a pilot program of grants to consortia and other institutional groupings to encourage colleges and universities within a geographical region to cooperate in determining peoples' needs, in planning educational programs and in sharing resources such as facilities, library collections, and computers.

As I have indicated, none of the bills on these two overall issues, either the ones introduced by Assemblyman Wilson or the series of bills introduced by Assemblyman Vasconcellos, have yet been heard by legislative committees. The major thrust on legislative discussion of these issues will undoubtedly take place during late April and May, although this will be determined to a certain extent on whether or not controversy surrounds the adoption of the 1976-77 budget. Should that occur, then it will undoubtedly be June or July before there will be detailed consideration of this legislation.

If I can provide additional information on any of the items contained in this report, please do not hesitate to contact me.

RAH. 10-I c

## Memorandum

To : Leslie Lebard

Date : April 5, 1976

File No.:

Copies : H. Jones

From : Robert E. Kennedy 

ACADEMIC SENATE

APR 8 1976

CAL POLY - SLO

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Actions

This is in response to your memos of March 4 and March 16, 1976, concerning four actions taken by the Academic Senate on February 17, 1976. I discussed these items briefly with you and Charles Jennings at our meeting on March 10.

Listed below are the business items you identified as requiring my action and/or comment:

1) Consultative Procedures on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (CAM 341.1)

By memo, dated March 18, 1976, I referred this item to Don Shelton, Director of Personnel Relations, for further review, consultation and recommendation.

2) Recommendation of Consultative Procedure--Curriculum Packages

This item was referred on March 13 to Hazel Jones, Vice President for Academic Affairs, for review and further consultation as appropriate.

3) Policy and Procedure Revisions in CAM

This resolution urges the president to "follow the same consultative process in the revision as well as the initiation of policies" as promulgated in CAM, and makes specific reference to a recent change in CAM 315.5B concerning the selection process for Instructional Department Heads. I take full responsibility for the oversight in not notifying the Academic Senate in advance of this revision. As I indicated to you on March 10, the change of the wording in this section from "not more than three nominees" to "at least three nominees" was a clarification of intent in the implementation of the CAM provision. The need for clarification of this section came to light recently when two different departments submitted only one name as a nominee for the department head position. In each case, I advised the department this was a misinterpretation of the intent of CAM and requested additional nominees be submitted to me for consideration. For your information, I am attaching a copy of the transmittal

memo, dated September 23, 1974, which approved the procedure in CAM concerning appointment of Instructional Department Heads. As you will note in the second paragraph of the memo, reference is made to the point that "the procedures have been revised to provide that nominees recommended by the department should not be submitted in order of preference." (underlining added) I trust this response will be helpful in understanding my position for changing the wording of the CAM section for clarification purposes. As I said at the onset, I should have given this explanation to the Academic Senate in advance of the change.

4) Credit/No Credit Grading

This recommendation was referred to Vice President Jones on March 18 for review as appropriate. I understand that the Academic Council has been holding this item in abeyance until input from the Academic Senate was received.

Attached for your records is an updated "score sheet" on items referred to the president with the above actions recorded.

# Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language

## APA TASK FORCE ON ISSUES OF SEXUAL BIAS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

In November 1972, the Education and Training Board of APA appointed a Task Force on Issues of Sexual Bias in Graduate Education. The charge to the Task Force was to conduct a content analysis of textbooks in graduate education in psychology, thereby establishing whether, and if so in what manner, there exist erroneous and harmful representations in the textbooks of either sex. Because the comprehensive question of sexual bias is definitely a complicated issue, the Task Force's investigation was defined as a pilot study to examine one aspect of graduate education; the analysis of textbooks only was considered an acceptable "first step" to clarify a complex and multifaceted question.

Membership to the Task Force was solicited through a public announcement in the *APA Monitor*. The appointed Task Force established six criteria for its content analysis: proportion of content devoted to women and to men; citations to women and to men; generalizations to human behavior with reference to sex of norm group; sex-associated descriptors, sexist colloquialisms and commentaries; sex differences. These six criteria then were applied to the 13 textbooks determined by survey to be the most commonly used textbooks in graduate education in psychology. The texts represent areas in psychology of child development, clinical, history, learning, personality, physiological, psychopathology, social, tests and measurement.

### Results

The content analysis of the textbooks made it clear that most of the authors were to be commended for the absence of gross sexist material—particularly salient since 9 of the 13 books were written in the 1960s, at which time sensitivity to sexism was not as refined as it is today. Generally, examples of sexism within the textbooks were attributable more to omission than to commission; for example, the infrequent presentation of women as subject matter is more noticeable than bias and misrepresentation within the material that is presented. The observation that women are invisible

as colleagues as well as subject matter was apparent from the limited representation of women scholars within the reviewed texts. The question exists whether women—systematically are excluded from the literature as alleged by Bernstein and Russo (1974).

In the acknowledgment section, women overwhelmingly were noted—as typists. Women also were cited as critical reviewers but a good deal less frequently than men (10 women and 77 men). Additionally, out of the 71 contributors to the 13 textbooks, only 4 were women.

By identifying the sex composition of as many research studies as possible, it was clear that women are strikingly absent as research subjects, thereby suggesting that generalizations to people in general are based frequently on research using one sex (most commonly males) or on research not specifying sex of the subject. These findings support previous research indications that women are less preferred than men as subjects of psychological research (Schwabacher, 1972; Prescott & Foster, Note 1). In studies in which the sample was comprised of both sexes, sex differences frequently were not interpreted or even noted—or if interpreted were given genetic-based interpretations.

Perhaps the area of most concern to the Task Force was that of the language in the reviewed textbooks and its clear bias toward the masculine. Unfortunately, such observations suggest deleterious effects (Schneider & Hacker, 1973). To offset language bias and to present several alternatives for nonsexist writing, the Task Force formulated literary guidelines and suggested their inclusion in the *APA Publication Manual*. Following are the guidelines and selected examples as corollaries for each guideline.

### Guidelines

#### STYLISTIC

The purpose of these stylistic guidelines is to overcome the impression presently embedded in the English language that (a) people in general are of the male gender and (b) certain social roles are automatically sex-linked. Another purpose is to insure that psychological writing does not degrade or circumscribe human beings.

*Use of the personal pronoun.* The author should attempt to find out the sex of the person or persons re-

Members of the Task Force are Janice M. Birk (Chair), Laura Barbanel, Linda Brooks, Michele H. Herman, Joseph B. Juhasz, Robert A. Seltzer, and Sandra S. Tangri.

This article is based on a report of the above Task Force. For the full report, see the *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents*, 1974, 4, 107 (Ms. No. 733).



ferred to, and use the appropriate personal pronoun.

WRONG: The individual's freedom to bear children should not be defined by his education, income, or race.

RIGHT: The individual's freedom to bear children should not be defined by her education, income, or race.

When sex of the antecedent is not practicably determinable, the author should avoid using a personal pronoun. The following alternatives are recommended: (a) use of the phrase *he* or *she*, *he/she*, *she* or *he*, or their alternative forms; (b) use of neuter words such as *person*, *one*, *human*, or the repetition of the antecedent; (c) use of the plural; (d) use of a neuter neologism such as *ter*, *tey*, *tem*.

WRONG: The school teacher is influential in personality development. She should be conscious of this.

RIGHT: Teachers are influential in personality development. They should be conscious of this.

WRONG: The psychologist has to finish graduate school before he uses his title.

RIGHT: The psychologist has to finish graduate school before she or he uses the title.

*Use of the generic term to indicate homo sapiens.* The author should avoid use of the terms *man* or *ankind* and instead use *human*, *human being*, *human-kind*, *people*, *persons*, or the like.

WRONG: Man craves pleasure.

RIGHT: People crave pleasure.

*Use of tendentious, salacious, or other questionable sex-linked material.* The author should not consider such phrases to be cute or catchy and should avoid their use.

WRONG: voluptuous belle

RIGHT: woman

*Use of irrelevant demographic information.* Characteristics such as marital status, physical appearance, age, race, and the like should be omitted when irrelevant.

WRONG: I should like to thank my secretary, Mrs. Jones.

RIGHT: I should like to thank my secretary, Sally Jones [or Ms. Jones or S. Jones].

*Use of parallel construction.* Authors should maintain parallel construction with sex-linked (as well as other) terms.

WRONG: The men and girls at X University.

RIGHT: The men and women at X University.

*Use of inaccurate terms.* The application of stereotypic terms to technical material should be avoided.

WRONG: The chimpanzees received mothering.

RIGHT: The chimpanzees received parental care [or nurturance, whichever was the case].

WRONG: The chairman opened the meeting.

RIGHT: The chairperson opened the meeting.

*Use of illustrations.* The guidelines apply to illus-

trations as well as written language; for example, in the case of pictures representing people in general it should not be assumed that people in general possess primary or secondary sex characteristics of either sex. Artists should be particularly sensitive to pictures that may be degrading to either sex.

## SUBSTANTIVE

The purpose of these substantive guidelines is to overcome errors of methodology and content (both of omission and commission) regarding sex differences and to improve the accuracy of materials presented.

*Unwarranted generalizations across sexes.* Authors should avoid generalizing from the behavior of one sex to that of the other. Specifically, when subjects are all of one sex, generalizations should not be made to people in general. It is the responsibility of each author to state the sex of the norm group for each study cited. If sex of the norm group cannot be determined, this should be noted by the author.

*Inclusion of available evidence on sex differences.* When research results yield sex differences, those differences should be reported.

*Interpretation of sex differences.* The author should consider all reasonable interpretations of reported sex differences, including the possibility of biases in methodology.

*Inclusion of sex of subject and experimenters.* The researcher should report the sex of subjects and experimenters.

*Review of colleagues of both sexes.* Authors should attempt to include colleagues of both sexes in the review of manuscripts.

*Feminist critique of subject matter.* Although the author may not and need not agree with this critique, it is recommended that the feminist point of view be acknowledged.

*Citation of women.* It has been noted that women are at times underrepresented in text citations in proportion to the number of eminent women in that field. Authors should avoid such misrepresentation.

*Perpetuation of sex typing.* The diminution of sex typing can be facilitated by the author's choice of examples, such as female names for medical doctors and male names for child caretakers. Also, such processes as the development of career choice or child care behaviors need not be sex specific. The discussion of such processes should not imply that these processes occur exclusively in members of one sex or the other.

## Conclusions

From the content analysis of the 13 textbooks, the Task Force concluded that (a) authors frequently fail to follow rules of good scholarship; for example, either sex differences are not reported or their discussion is restricted to genetic-based interpretations, and labeling



confusion is demonstrated by applying stereotypic terms to technical matters, such as *mothering* instead of *nurturing*; (b) women are invisible in psychology textbooks as research subjects, as scientists, and as subject matter; (c) literary style and language is biased toward the masculine. By ignoring such conditions, the status quo is perpetuated, whereas responsible attention by psychologists to the style and content of their writing allows the profession to play an active part in creating human equality.

#### REFERENCE NOTE

1. Prescott, S., & Foster, K. *Why researchers don't study women: The responses of 67 researchers*. Paper pre-

sented at the meeting of the Midwest Sociological Association, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 1973.

#### REFERENCES

- Bernstein, M., & Russo, N. The history of psychology revisited, or up with our foremothers. *American Psychologist*, 1974, 29, 130-134.
- Schneider, J. W., & Hacker, S. L. Sex roles imagery and use of the generic "man" in introductory texts: A case in the sociology of sociology. *The American Sociologist*, 1973, 8, 12-18.
- Schwabacher, S. Male versus female representation in psychological research: An examination of the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, 1971. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents*, 1972, 2, 20-21. (Ms. No. 82)